

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/514,928	02/28/2000	Peter J. Wilk	W07-428	9269	
R Neil Sudol	7590 01/30/2007		EXAM	EXAMINER  JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J	
Coleman Sudo	ol Sapone, P.C.	•	JAWORSKI		
714 Colorado Bridgeport, C			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
28.			3768		
SHORTENED STATUTO	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MG	ONTHS	01/30/2007	PAI	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/514,928	WILK ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jaworski Francis J.	3768					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence addre	·ss				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D/ - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr , cause the application to become ABANDO	ON.  timely filed  om the mailing date of this comm  NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 No	ovember 2006						
<u> </u>	action is non-final.						
<u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>31,33-35 and 47-49</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>31,33-35,47-49</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	s have been received	•					
<ul> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> </ul>							
	• •		iae				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	·						
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa						
2)	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/514,928

Art Unit: 3768

3

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Double Patenting**

The finality of the prior Office action has been WITHDRAWN pursuant to the discovery of a conflicting application by applicants on search update.

Claims 31, 33 – 35 and 47 - 49 of this application were found on intended processing for allowance to conflict with corresponding method claims of Application No. 10/663,084. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

Hence while applicants may have filed the latter '084 application pursuant to a restriction requirement by the Patent Office between apparatus and method set forth on December 10, 2002, the '084 filing retains method claim sets directed inter alia to practice of arrays mounted to flexible substrates and operating according to self-cohering algorithms or forming data gathering apertures and transmit/receive sets for obtaining a three-dimensional analog or models.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

Art Unit: 3768

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 31, 33 – 35 and 47 – 49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims respectively of copending Application No. 10/663,084. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because as noted above, this divisional application has been filed without inter alia a preliminary amendment canceling method claims having subject matter which in response to the December 10, 2002 restriction applicants elected to pursue in this case.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

This action is NOT made final however the case should be prepared for final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj 12/10/06

Francis J. Jaworski Primary Examiner